

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/804,947	Applicant(s) THUNEY ET AL.	
	Examiner THOMAS M. HAMMOND III	Art Unit 3691	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) THOMAS M. HAMMOND III. (3) ____.

(2) Brian Kaul, Applicant's Representative. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 09 April 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kaplan.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The express identification of elements of Kaplan was discussed relative to the requirements of claim 1. The Examiner and Mr. Kaul attempted to explain their positions, however no agreements were reached. The Examiner requested that the Applicant clearly identify the elements of his invention and how such elements are not met by Kaplan.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.